



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/766,607 12/13/96 JACOBSEN

J KPN96-03A

EXAMINER

LM01/1108

THOMAS O HOOVER  
HAMILTON SMITH BROOK & REYNOLDS  
TWO MILITIA DRIVE  
LEXINGTON MA 02173-4799

PIZIALI, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2778

DATE MAILED:

11/08/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/766,607

Applicant(s)

Jacobsen et al.

Examiner

Jeff Piziali

Group Art Unit

2778



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 23, 1999

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 6, 8 & 11

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

MATTHEW LUU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2778

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required if the application is allowed.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement filed October 2, 1997 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered because no copies of the cited references have been found by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2774

4. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilska et al. (United Kingdom - 2,289,555) in view of Fan et al. (5,815,126).

In regards to claim 1, Wilska et al. disclose a telephone docking system [17] comprising a handheld housing [1] (see Figures 1-3; Page 5, Paragraph 3), a plurality of control elements [10, 11] (see Figure 3; Page 4, Paragraph 3), a telephone connection port [8] (see Figure 3; Page 5, Paragraph 3) and a liquid crystal display [9] (see Figures 1-2; Page 4, Paragraph 2). Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose an active matrix LCD, a light source or a magnifying image lens.

However, Fan et al. disclose an active matrix liquid crystal display (see Column 1, Lines 45-58), a light source (see Figure 19; Column 13, Lines 7-34), and a magnifying image lens (see Figure 52A; Column 23, Lines 7-11). Wilska et al. and Fan et al. are analogous art because they are both from the field of portable communication and display devices. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the to utilize Fan's active matrix LCD, light source and magnifying lens with Wilska's communication device. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a high quality liquid crystal image that's easy to see (and read) even in the dark. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

In regards to claim 2, Wilska et al. disclose at least a 320 x 240 pixel array (see Page 4, Paragraph 2).

Art Unit: 2774

In regards to claim 3, Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose a 640 x 480 pixel array. However, Fan et al. disclose at least a 640 x 480 pixel array (see Column 3, Lines 30-35). For the purpose of providing enhanced picture quality, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

In regards to claim 4, Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose a transistor circuit array formed with single crystal silicon bonded to an optically transmissive substrate (see Column 1, Lines 45-58). However, Fan et al. disclose a transistor circuit array formed with single crystal silicon bonded to an optically transmissive substrate (see Column 1, Lines 45-58). For the purpose of providing fast operation, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

In regards to claim 5, Wilska et al. disclose a transmitter (see Figures 1-2; Page 5, Paragraph 3).

In regards to claim 6, Wilska et al. disclose a housing having a volume less than 1000 cm<sup>3</sup> (see Page 3, Paragraph 8).

Art Unit: 2774

In regards to claim 7, Wilska et al. disclose a docking system [17] for a wireless telephone [17] comprising: a handheld housing [1] having a plurality of control elements [10, 11] and a connection port [8] (see Figures 1-3; Page 4, Paragraph 3 and Page 5, Paragraph 3), a display subhousing [9] carried by the housing and moveable between a storage and operating position (see Figures 7-9), and a liquid crystal display [9] (see Figures 1-2; Page 4, Paragraph 2). Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose an active matrix LCD. However, Fan et al. disclose an active matrix LCD (see Column 1, Lines 45-58). For the reasons set forth in the above rejection of claim 1, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

In regards to claim 8, Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose a timing circuit. However, Fan et al. disclose a timing circuit (see Column 8, Lines 44-56). For the purpose of regulating flow to the display, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

In regards to claim 9, Wilska et al. disclose a battery [3] (see Figure 3).

In regards to claim 10, Wilska et al. disclose a cradle [16] (see Figure 2; Page 5, Paragraph 2). For the purpose of securing the telephone to the communication device, it would

Art Unit: 2774

have been obvious to utilize Wilska's cradle to connect a telephone and to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

In regards to claim 11, Wilska et al. disclose a connector [8] adapted to be received in a port in the wireless telephone [17], further comprising a latch [16]. For the purpose of securing the telephone to the communication device, it would have been obvious to utilize Wilska's latch to connect a telephone and to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

In regards to claim 12, Wilska et al. disclose a hidden lens in the storage position and a viewable lens in the operating position (see Figures 7-9; Page 10, Paragraph 3).

In regards to claim 13, Wilska et al. disclose a rotatable display subhousing (see Figures 7-9; Page 10, Paragraph 3).

In regards to claim 14, Wilska et al. disclose a display subhousing that translates relative to the housing (see Figures 7-9; Page 10, Paragraph 3).

In regards to claim 15, Wilska et al. disclose a display that both rotates and moves translationally (see Figures 7-9; Page 10, Paragraph 3).

Art Unit: 2774

In regards to claim 16, Wilska et al. does not expressly disclose the array of pixel electrodes has a diagonal of 0.25 inches. However, for the purposes of manufacturing an easy to read display while keeping the display small and portable, it would have been obvious to utilize a diagonal of 0.25 inches to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

In regards to claim 17, Wilska et al. disclose a docking system [17] for a telephone [17] comprising: a housing [1] having a plurality of control elements [10, 11] and a connection port [8] (see Figures 1-3; Page 4, Paragraph 3 and Page 5, Paragraph 3), a display subhousing [9] carried by the housing and moveable between a storage and operating position (see Figures 7-9), and a liquid crystal display [9] (see Figures 1-2; Page 4, Paragraph 2) and a battery [3] (see Figure 3). Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose an active matrix LCD, an LED light source or a magnifying image lens. However, Fan et al. disclose an active matrix liquid crystal display (see Column 1, Lines 45-58 and Column 3, Lines 25-37), an LED light source (see Figure 19; Column 2, Lines 55-60 and Column 13, Lines 7-34), and a magnifying image lens (see Figure 52A; Column 23, Lines 7-11). For the reasons set forth in the above rejection of claim 1, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.



Art Unit: 2774

In regards to claim 18, Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose a backlight. However, Fan et al. disclose a backlight (see Figure 19; Column 13, Lines 7-34). For the reasons set forth in the above rejection of claim 1, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

In regards to claim 19, Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose a side illumination device. However, Fan et al. disclose a side illumination device (see Column 2, Lines 49-55). For the reasons set forth in the above rejection of claim 1, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

In regards to claim 20, Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose a timing circuit. However, Fan et al. disclose a timing circuit (see Column 8, Lines 44-56). For the purpose of regulating flow to the display, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

In regards to claim 21, Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose drawing less than 0.2 watts. However, for the purpose of drawing very little power, it would have been obvious to draw less than 0.2 watts to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Art Unit: 2774

In regards to claim 22, Wilska et al. disclose a method of displaying an image on a docking system [17] in conjunction with a wireless telephone [17], comprising the steps of: providing a docking station system [17] having an LCD [9], a display control circuit [6] and a connection port [8]; providing a wireless telephone handset [17] having a transceiver capable of receiving audio and image data, and a connection port; connecting electrically and physically the wireless telephone [17] in the docking station [17]; and operating the display control circuit [6] to display an image on the display [9] (see Figures 1-3; Page 5, Paragraph 3). Wilska et al. do not expressly disclose an active matrix LCD. However, Fan et al. disclose an active matrix LCD (see Column 1, Lines 45-58). For the reasons set forth in the above rejection of claim 1, it would have been obvious to combine Wilska et al. and Fan et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

In regards to claim 23, Wilska et al. disclose a battery [3] (see Figure 3).

In regards to claim 24, Wilska et al. disclose a camera [15, 16] (see Figures 1-3; Page 4, Paragraph 5).

In regards to claim 25, Wilska et al. disclose selecting to view the camera image on the display, or transmitting the image to a remote location (see Figures 1-3; Page 5, Paragraph 1).

Art Unit: 2774

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2774

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (703) 305-8382. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:30 AM to 3 PM E.S.T.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached on (703) 305-4938.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE")

**Or:**

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



**MATTHEW LUU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

28 11/4/99